

REMARKS

Claims 84-90 and 94 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 79, 80, and 91-93 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter disclosed therein, claims 84-90 are amended, and new claim 94 is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that the Office Action indicates that claims 84, 85, 90, and 93 are allowed, and that claims 86-89 and 92 contain allowable subject matter. However, for at least the reasons described below, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims 84-90 and 94 contain allowable subject matter.

The Office Action rejects claims 79, 80, 86-89, and 92 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The cancellation of claims 79, 80, and 92 renders their rejection moot. The rejection of claims 86-89 is respectfully traversed. Originally-filed Specification provides written description for an active matrix substrate including at least a video signal line at, for example, Fig. 1A and corresponding disclosures on pg. 10, lines 15 to 28, Fig. 21 and corresponding disclosures on pg. 12, line 27 to page 13, line 2, and Background Technology on pg. 1, lines 14-21. For example, a liquid crystal display device is formed by the combination of an active matrix substrate 3100 and a counter matrix substrate 3000, as illustrated in Fig. 21. Moreover, as discussed in Background Technology, the need to provide driver integrated circuits is removed if it is possible to form active matrix driving circuits from TFTs and fabricate those TFTs at the same time as the pixel TFTs on an active matrix substrate (Specification, pg. 1, ll. 14-21). Therefore, originally-filed Specification provides written description for an active matrix substrate that includes at least a video signal line. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 79 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herold (U.S. Patent No. 5,481,651) in view of Tu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,335,254), and rejects claims 80 and 91 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,901,066). The cancellation of claims 79, 80, and 91 renders their rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejections.

New independent claim 94, although of different scope, recites features similar to those of allowed claim 84 that define patentable subject matter. Moreover, as the Office Action admits in paragraph 7 on page 5, none of the references cited, including Herold, Kobayashi et al., and Tu et al., teach a first output enable signal line and a second output enable signal line, wherein each of a plurality of first NAND circuit electrically connecting the first output enable signal line and each of a plurality of second NAND circuit electrically connecting the second output enable signal line, as recited in allowed claim 84, and similarly recited in new claim 94. Accordingly, claim 94 is allowable over cited references.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of claims 86-89 and prompt allowance of claims 84-90 and 94 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Joshua C. Liu
Registration No. 55,391

JAO:JCL:dx

Date: January 29, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--